REMARKS

In the Office Action, made final, the Examiner rejected claims 1-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious. Claims 1-27 remain under examination.

The Examiner reiterated previous arguments and added comments directed to the applicants' previous amendment. In this regard, Araki and Gruodis remain as the two references used in rejecting all of the claims although some claims are rejected based on additional references.

Araki only describes testing a simulation although applicants certainly admit that testing a simulation is with a view to making an integrated circuit that itself will be tested. Gruodis describes only testing an integrated circuit. Gruodis describes that in the course of testing the integrated circuit, opcodes are generated for the purpose of providing directions to the IC tester. The Examiner argued that since using opcodes is known for testing an integrated circuit it would be obvious to use opcodes for testing a simulation. What the Examiner argues is obvious still does not meet any of applicants' independent claims because it still doesn't result in taking the opcodes from the simulation and using them in the testing of the integrated circuit. That point aside, the Examiner's conclusion that it would be obvious to use the opcodes generated in testing the integrated circuit in the testing of simulation is fundamentally flawed.

The opcodes of Gruodis are for directing the IC tester. Such opcodes have no utility in testing a simulation in Araki. The approach described by Araki for testing a simulation would have no use for opcodes. The Araki approach of testing a simulation does not have anything in it that would be able make use of opcodes. Notice in particular that Tester Opcodes are not present in the Dump File Storage-25 of Araki. The Dump File Storage is generated from the Logic Simulation-22 which has no use for Tester Opcodes, and thus they are not present. Similarly, for the system of applicants' prior art FIG. 1, there is nothing in the testing of the simulation that could make use of opcodes. This prior art FIG. 1 does show an IC tester 28 that is capable of responding to opcodes but that is not used in testing the simulation. Accordingly, applicants submit that there is simply no incentive or suggestion to combine the opcodes of Gruodis with the simulation testing systems of Araki or applicants' prior art FIG. 1 and therefore independent claims 1, 12, 18, and 22 are patentably distinct from the art of record.

2

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

With this understanding the dependent claims should be analyzed differently as well.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited. Please contact the below-signed if there are any issues regarding this communication or otherwise concerning the current application.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

By: _James L. Clingan_

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.
Law Department

James L. Clingan, Jr
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 30,163

Customer Number: 23125

Telephone:
Fax No.: (512) 996-6854

3